

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Request for Entry of After-Final Reply:

It is respectfully requested that this after-final amendment and reply be considered and entered, since it is believed to place this application in condition for allowance without requiring further consideration and/or search.

Status of Claims:

No claims are currently being cancelled or added.

Claim 25 is currently being amended, whereby the scope of that claim has been unaffected and whereby an obvious typographical error has been corrected by way of this amendment.

This amendment amends a claim in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1, 4-6, 9, 10, 12, 17, 20-26, 29, 30 and 33-38 are now pending in this application.

Claim Rejections:

In the Office Action, claims 1, 5, 9-13, 37, 17, 21, 23, 24, 35, 38, 26, 30, 33 and 36 were rejected over 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,042,614 to Davidson, and claims 4, 20, 22, 25, 29 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davidson in view of SPARCworks "Sun Product Documentation." These rejections are traversed for at least the reasons given below.

In its rejection of independent claim 1, the Office Action asserts that column 8, line 37, and column 9, line 65 to column 10, line 12 of Davidson

discloses the features recited in the last paragraph of that claim. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion.

In particular, the last paragraph of claim 1 recites, among other things, that the same execution status is maintained on all computers on which the distributed debugger system operates. Column 8, line 37 of Davidson discloses three types of breakpoint commands, whereby nowhere does this portion of Davidson mention that a same execution status is maintained on all computers on which the distributed debugger operates; rather, it appears that only a host computer maintains that information.

Column 9, line 65 to column 10, line 12 of Davidson describes that dbx engines on different computers can communicate with each other, whereby it is possible to obtain information on all active dbx engines from a debugger-GUI. However, this is not particularly relevant to the features recited in the last paragraph of claim 1, which recite specifics concerning which computers (all) maintain a same execution status.

Accordingly, claim 1 is not anticipated by Davidson.

With respect to independent claim 17, the Office Action asserts that the last paragraph of that claim is disclosed in column 8, line 37 and column 9, line 65 to column 10, line 12 of Davidson. For the same reasons given above with respect to independent claim 1, this assertion is incorrect.

Still further, with respect to claim 17, that claim recites a step of notifying said debuggers on said other computers of said instruction via communications sent over a network which communicatively couples said plural computers only when said instruction has not come via the network but instead has come from a same one of said computers that said debugger operates on. The Office Action asserts that column 10, lines 1-6 of Davidson discloses these features, but this assertion is incorrect. In particular, the Office Action states that "Davidson discloses inter dbx communication (column 10, lines 1-6)", and while this statement is correct *per se*, the above-mentioned step of claim 17 recites much more features than providing inter dbx communication. In claim

17, only when an instruction has not come in via the network but instead has come from a same one of said computers that said debugger operates on, is a notification made. The mere fact that Davidson teaches inter dbx communications has nothing at all to do with these features of claim 17.

Still further, claim 17 recites that the execution status of another computer is changed based on an occurrence of a temporary halt status due to the detecting of a breakpoint. In other words, the detecting of a breakpoint in one computer results in a standstill in the other computers in the thread. These other computers are effectively automatically stopped due to the breakpoint being detected in one computer. Davidson does not teach or suggest these features.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 17 is not anticipated by Davidson.

Similarly, with respect to independent claim 26, the Office Action asserts that the rejection as set forth with respect to claim 17 also applies to claim 26. For the same reasons given above with respect to independent claim 17, this assertion is incorrect.

Accordingly, claim 26 is not anticipated by Davidson.

In its rejection of claims 37 and 38, the Office Action asserts that column 13, lines 6-43 of Davidson discloses the features of this claim; Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion. In particular, claims 37 and 38 each recites that the setting-status manager of the executor only notifies all other computers in which the distributed debugger operates of a change in setting only when the change in setting originated at a same computer on which the executor operates. Thus, changes in settings from other computers are not forwarded by the executor; only changes in settings from the computer of the executor itself.

Column 13, lines 6-20 of Davidson merely describes the setting of a breakpoint by way of a message sent to a dbx engine, whereby notification of receipt of the breakpoint setting message is sent back to the device that

requested that the breakpoint be set. The request to set a breakpoint in a computer does not correspond to a change in setting of a computer, and thus column 13, lines 6-20 of Davidson is not particularly relevant to the features recited in claims 37 and 38. Column 13, lines 21-43 of Davidson describes the means by which one dbx engine communicates with another dbx engine, by way of "rcmd" messages that contain the name of a host machine, the processor id (pid) of a process being debugged by a target dbx, and a message for the target dbx. When a debugger-GUI gets a "rcmd" message, it searches its list of dbx engines for a dbx engine that is running on the named host machine and is debugging a process with the given pid, whereby the message is delivered to that dbx engine. This method of sending messages between dbx engines in Davidson is not particularly relevant to the features recited in claims 37 and 38, in which a setting-status manager of an executor only notifies all other computers of a change in setting only when the change in setting originated at a same computer on which the executor operates. Column 13, lines 6-43 of Davidson does not deal with a change in setting at a computer, and which other computers to notify of that change in setting. Accordingly, claims 37 and 38 each distinguishes over the teachings of Davidson.

Conclusion:

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account

No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date November 2, 2004

Phillip J. Arcola
Phillip J. Arcola
Registration No. 38,819

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5300
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399